

REMARKS

In the Official Action mailed on **04 August 2009**, the Examiner reviewed claims 1, 3, 5-9, 11, 13-17, 19, 21-24, and 35-39. Examiner rejected claims 1, 3, 5-9, 11, 13-17, 19, 21-24, 35-37, and 40 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) based on Jonsson et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,164,885, hereinafter “Jonsson”).

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

Examiner has rejected dependent claims 3, 11, and 19 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) based on Jonsson. More specifically, Examiner argued that:

“As to claim 3, Jonsson teaches the method of claim, further comprising:

- receiving a multicast message from a second client
- querying a second device;
- locating a second resource record from a second client
- querying a second device;
- waiting for a multicast response to the multicast query; and
- if after a pre-determined number of queries the multicast response to the multicast query is not received in the pre-determined amount of time, invalidating the second resource record (Column 7, lines 23-65, Column 8, lines 15 – Column 9, lines 8)” (see office action, page 3).

Applicant respectfully disagrees with the rejection. The cited art, Jonsson, nowhere discloses receiving a multicast message from a second client OR updating a resource record based on whether another device responds to the query.

Jonsson discloses a system wherein an initiator node maintains a device list and a candidate list to enable the use of services on a Bluetooth network. In the Jonsson system, the initiator node **sends out** an INQUIRY message regarding a desired service and maintains the device list and the candidate list based on the INQUIRY RESPONSE messages **it receives from devices** within its range that

offer the desired service (see Jonsson, Column 7, lines 23-65, Column 8, lines 15 – Column 9, lines 8). In other words, in the Jonsson system, there is no second client that sends a message to a device that is received by a first client (i.e., where the first client maintains the list). For example, Jonsson expressly describes this operation as follows:

Thus, at T1 in FIG. 8(a), the **PDA (acting as the initiator) sends out an INQUIRY message** and has an empty device and candidate list. At T2, the initiator has received INQUIRY RESPONSES from the devices within its range that offer the desired service, in this example Internet access. Thus the device list now contains information associated with devices A, B and C (see Jonsson, col. 8, lines 15-21, emphasis added).

Applicant respectfully submits that there is nothing in Jonsson, either implicit or explicit, that discloses that a client may receive multicast messages that include queries broadcast from another client to a separate device as well as the corresponding responses from the device to the other client on the network, and update resource record information based on the received queries and responses.

In contrast, in the claimed embodiments, a client uses multicast messages exchanged between another client and a device to determine when a resource record in the client for the device should be updated/deleted. As described in the instant application:

computer system 102 receives a multicast message from computer system 104, wherein the multicast message queries a service provided by printer 106 ... Computer system 102 looks in its local cache to locate service record 204 that corresponds to the query from computer system 104 ... Next, computer system 102 waits for a response from the service ... Note that in the present invention, devices and services respond to queries by sending a multicast message to network 100 rather than a unicast message directed only to the system that created the query. By sending a multicast response, this allows other devices on network 100 to update corresponding entries in their local caches without consuming extra bandwidth. If the service responds, computer system 102 updates corresponding resource records, such as address record 206 and service record 204, or creates new versions of address record 206 and service

record 204, if necessary ... If there is no response from the service, computer system 102 deletes service record 204 ... as proceeds to reconfirm any records in the local cache which may refer to

Applicant has rewritten dependent claims 3, 11, and 19, as independent claims 1, 9, and 17. Applicant has also canceled dependent claims 3, 11, and 19 without prejudice. Applicant has further amended claims 5-6, 13-14, and 21-22 in light of the amendments to the independent claims. No new matter has been added.

Hence, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 9, and 17, as presently amended, are in condition for allowance. Applicant also submits that dependent claims which depend upon these independent claims are for the same reasons in condition for allowance and for reasons of the unique combinations recited in such claims.

Rejection of Claim 40 under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Examiner rejected claim 40 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) based on Jonsson. Applicant respectfully disagrees with the rejection. When establishing a prima facie case when rejecting claims under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e), the Examiner's cited prior art must contain every element of the claimed subject matter:

A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference (see MPEP § 2131).

Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner has failed to establish prima facie anticipation because there is at least one fundamental distinction between Jonsson and the claimed invention. More specifically, there is nothing in Jonsson, either explicit or implicit, that discloses the following claim language in claim 40:

“looking up an address record referenced by the service record and using a host address and a port number in the address record to send a query to the service on the network;”

“upon sending the predetermined number of queries without receiving a response, marking the address record referenced by the service record as suspect”

“if the service does not respond after a predetermined time and after resending the query a predetermined number times:
deleting the address record.
marking the service record as suspect;”

Because Jonsson nowhere discloses the claimed subject matter, Jonsson cannot anticipate the claimed embodiments. Applicant therefore respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102 of claim 40.

CONCLUSION

It is submitted that the application is presently in form for allowance.
Such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By /Anthony Jones/
Anthony Jones
Registration No. 59,521

Date: 04 November 2009

Anthony Jones
Park, Vaughan & Fleming LLP
2820 Fifth Street
Davis, CA 95618-7759
Tel: (530) 759-1666
Fax: (530) 759-1665
Email: tony@parklegal.com